

ARIZONA ARSENIC MASTER PLAN

PART 3 - COMPLIANCE OPTIONS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1	OBJECTIVES	1-2
1.2	DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION AND STRUCTURE	1-2
1.2.1	Section 2 - Impacted Water Systems	1-2
1.2.2	Section 3 - Water Quality Assessment	1-3
1.2.3	Section 4 - Treatment Alternatives and Cost Models	1-3
1.2.4	Section 5 - Cost Assessment	1-5
1.2.5	Appendices	1-5
1.2.5.1	Develop Criteria for Non-Treatment Options	1-5
1.2.5.2	Criteria for Point of Use Devices	1-5
1.2.5.3	Web Based Decision Analysis Tool	1-6
2.0	INTRODUCTION	2-1
2.1	MCL COMPLIANCE CRITERIA	2-2
2.1.1	Method 1: Average Arsenic Levels Greater Than 10 ppb	2-2
2.1.2	Method 2: Single Maximum Arsenic Levels Greater Than 10 ppb	2-2
2.1.3	Method 3: Single Maximum Arsenic Levels Greater Than 10 ppb and Less Than 8 ppb	2-2
3.0	INTRODUCTION	3-1
3.1	SOURCE WATER DATA	3-1
3.2	WATER QUALITY IMPACTS ON ARSENIC REMOVAL	3-1
3.2.1	Silica	3-1
3.2.2	pH and Alkalinity	3-2
3.2.3	Fluoride	3-2
3.2.4	Phosphorus	3-2
3.2.5	Sulfate	3-3
3.2.6	Total Dissolved Solids	3-3
3.2.7	Iron and Manganese	3-3
3.3	COMPETING CONTAMINANT DATA	3-3
3.4	RECOMMENDATIONS	3-6

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

4.0	INTRODUCTION	4-1
4.1	TREATMENT ALTERNATIVES FOR SMALL UTILITIES	4-1
4.1.1	Alternative 1 - Single Column Treatment Using Fe-AA	4-1
4.1.2	Alternative 2 - Single Column Treatment Using Iron Media	4-2
4.1.3	Alternative 3 - Two Column Series Treatment Using Fe-AA	4-2
4.1.4	Alternative 3 - Two Column Series Treatment Using Granular Iron Media ..	4-3
4.1.5	Alternative 5 - Coagulation with Granular Media Filtration	4-3
4.1.6	Alternative 6 - Point-of-Use Devices	4-4
4.2	TREATMENT COST ASSUMPTIONS	4-4
4.2.1	Adsorption Media (Fe-AA and Iron Media) Cost Assumptions	4-5
4.2.1.1	Media Replacement	4-5
4.2.1.2	Single Column Treatment	4-5
4.2.1.3	Two Column Treatment	4-5
4.2.1.4	Capital Costs	4-7
4.2.1.5	Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Costs	4-7
4.2.2	Coagulation with Granular Media Filtration Cost Assumptions	4-8
4.2.2.1	Capital Costs	4-8
4.2.2.2	O&M Costs	4-8
4.2.3	POU Adsorption and POU RO Cost Assumptions	4-9
4.3	EXISTING PILOT TESTING DATA	4-9
4.4	DEVELOPMENT OF COST MODELS	4-10
4.4.1	Alternatives 1a and 1b Cost Models	4-10
4.4.1.1	System Design Criteria	4-10
4.4.1.2	Cost Evaluation	4-14
4.4.2	Alternatives 2a and 2b Cost Models	4-18
4.4.2.1	System Design Criteria	4-18
4.4.2.2	Cost Evaluation	4-18
4.4.3	Alternatives 3a and 3b Cost Models	4-24
4.4.3.1	System Design Criteria	4-24
4.4.3.2	Cost Evaluation	4-24
4.4.4	Alternatives 3c and 3d Cost Models	4-32
4.4.4.1	System Design Criteria	4-32
4.4.4.2	Cost Evaluation	4-32
4.4.5	Alternatives 4a and 4b Cost Models	4-40
4.4.5.1	System Design Criteria	4-40
4.4.5.2	Cost Evaluation	4-40
4.4.6	Alternatives 4c and 4d Cost Models	4-46
4.4.6.1	System Design Criteria	4-46
4.4.6.2	Cost Evaluation	4-46

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

4.4.7	Alternatives 5a and 5b Cost Models	4-52
4.4.7.1	System Design Criteria	4-52
4.4.7.2	Cost Evaluation	4-54
4.4.8	Alternatives 6 Cost Model	4-59
4.4.8.1	Cost Evaluation	4-59
4.4.8.2	POU Reverse Osmosis Costs	4-59
4.4.8.3	POU Adsorption Costs	4-59
4.4.8.4	POU Cost Evaluation from AwwaRF Survey	4-60
4.5	SUMMARY	4-62
5.0	INTRODUCTION	5-1
5.1	SYSTEM CONFIGURATION INFORMATION	5-1
5.2	TECHNOLOGY FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENT	5-2
5.2.1	Feasibility based on Competing Contaminants	5-2
5.3	COST EVALUATION ON A STATE-WIDE BASIS	5-3
5.3.1	Combined Treatment and Blending Considerations	5-4
5.3.2	POU Considerations	5-4
5.4	SUMMARY	5-5